

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 15-30 are pending in this application. Claims 15, 16, 19, 20, 23, 24, 27, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. patent application publication 2002/0032907 to Daniels. Claims 17, 18, 21, 22, 25, 26, 29, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Daniels in view of the vCalendar Specification, v0.4 (herein the “vCalendar Specification”).

Addressing the above-noted rejections, those rejections are traversed by the present response.

Each of the independent claims is amended by the present response to make a clarification, and to specifically clarify that the server transmits data to the remote device such that “the transmitted data [is] transmitted appended to an e-mail”. That subject matter is fully supported by the original specification for example at page 35, line 8 et seq. Such a claimed feature is believed to clearly distinguish over the applied art.

The claims are directed to an apparatus or method in which a server can store a program table. The user can then select programs on that program table by accessing the server through a network, for example the Internet. As shown for example in Figure 1 in the present specification a user at a remote device 1-1 can access a server 7 through a network 6, such as the Internet, and thereby access a program table such as shown in Figure 16. The user can then select programs for recording on the program table accessed through the network. The server 7 containing the program table can then transmit back to the user at the remote device data of the selected programs, that transmitted data being transmitted appended to an e-mail. The data indicates a specific channel of the program, the date and time for starting the recording, and the data and time for terminating the recording.

Applicants respectfully submit Daniels clearly fails to teach or suggest any operation in which the control data for controlling the recording at the user remote device is transmitted appended to an e-mail. The specific examples Daniels provides of transmitting control information for controlling recording at a VCR disclose embedding the VCR control information within television programming information or provided in a special television channel on a cable system.¹ Such operations in Daniels are not at all directed to transmitting recording control information to a user device appended to an e-mail.

One statement noted in the Office Action is that “Daniel further discloses that VCR control information can be updated via e-mail (p. 14, paragraph 140)”.²

In response to that statement in the Office Action, applicants note the disclosure in Daniels at paragraph [0140] is directed to the flow chart shown in Figure 15, which is directed to receiving a programming schedule request. That is, in Daniels a user requests a programming schedule, and Daniels discloses in paragraph [0140] that the user can request the programming schedule via e-mail. That disclosure in Daniels is ***not directed to sending VCR control information***, which is shown in Figure 18 in Daniels. With respect to operations of sending VCR control information such as shown for example in Figure 18 in Daniels, Daniels does not disclose or suggest any operation in which such VCR control information can be sent embedded in an e-mail.

In such ways, the claims as currently written are believed to positively recite features neither taught nor suggested by Daniels.

Moreover, no teachings in the vCalendar Specification are believed to cure the above-noted deficiencies in Daniels.

In view of these foregoing comments, Applicants respectfully submit the claims as currently written distinguish over the applied art.


¹ See for example, Daniels at page 14, paragraph [0144].

² Office Action of March 14, 2004, bottom of page 3.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

I:\ATTY\SNS\20's\209880\209880US-AM DUE 6-14-06.DOC

Scott A. McKeown
Registration No. 42,866